APPENDIX I

Vol. 33, No. 25 June 21, 1974

Report on the SPRING MEETING OF THE MID-ATLANTIC REGIONAL ARCHIVES CONFERENCE Charlottesville, Virginia, April 26 and 27, 1974

The spring meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC) was held April 26 and 27 in Charlottesville, Va. Over 150 members attended the meeting, which featured panel and discussion groups held on both Friday and Saturday, and a business meeting on Friday evening. In addition to introductory sessions on the basics of conservation, exhibits, finding aids, and appraisal, there were discussions on various other topics relating to the problems and realities of the archival profession.

Library of Congress employees participated in two of the introductory sessions. Arline Custer, Editor of the *National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections* (NUCMC), led a session on reporting collections to NUCMC. Anita Nolen of the Manuscript Division conducted a session on basic reference collections and distributed copies of a bibliography of books and articles useful for persons working with archives and manuscripts.

A panel on Friday morning discussed the relationship between historic preservation and archives, including how preservationists use archives, the various types of materials they find pertinent, and how they can help archivist. Further discussion focused on the need for archival preservation of architectural records and blueprints, the problems of storing architectural records because of their unwieldy size and the lack of space at most archival institutions, the irreparable loss to America's cultural history when these records are deliberately or accidentally destroyed, and the need for a national institution to collect or sponsor the collection of such records.

Charles L. Perdue, University of Virginia, and J. Roderick Moore, Blue Ridge Institute of Virginia, conducted a session about "Archiving Virginia Folklore." They discussed the problems they have encountered in recording, documenting, cataloging, indexing, describing, storing, and retrieving physical objects, such as quilts and plows, and traditions, such as patterns for harnessing mules and planting techniques. They mentioned the difficulty of attributing songs to individual musicians without exposing them to exploitation by record companies. They also asked that traditional archivists view their holdings with an eye for documenting hitherto unwritten history, such as noting what collections have wills with inventories which the folklore scholar could use to document household items common at any given period in American history. The discussion leaders and several of those present expressed support for the bill now pending in Congress for the establishment of a Folk Life Center for the collection of American folklore.

Both editors and archivists participated in a panel discussion of the ways archivists can help editors of historical and documentary publications and vice versa. Other group discussions focused on the future of MARAC, its goals, what it should be doing for its members and the professions, and what type of publications MARAC should encourage or sponsor.

At the business meeting Friday evening, it was announced that MARAC had now obtained official tax-exempt status as a non-profit educational organization. Don Harrison of the National Archives and Records Service, who has been serving as editor of the *Newsletter*, will retire from that position after the next (summer) issue and is looking for someone interested in becoming editor or in helping with the *Newsletter* in other ways. The conference passed two resolutions. The first endorsed NUCMC as a central source of information concerning the holdings of repositories throughout the country and urged all institutions in the mid-Atlantic region to report their holdings to NUCMC. A second resolution commended Mary Walton Livingston of the Office of Presidential Libraries of the National Archives and Records Service for her actions regarding the vice-presidential papers of Richard M. Nixon.

Special features of the conference included a slide presentation at the Friday luncheon by Frederick D. Nichols of the University of Virginia School of Architecture, in which he traced the history of the University's Rotunda from Jefferson's early ideas and designs to its rebuilding by Stanford White after a fire destroyed it in 1895. A tour of the University, including the Alderman Library and its Manuscript Department, was given on Saturday afternoon.

The next MARAC meeting will convene in Newark, N.J., on November 1 and 2, and the spring 1975 meeting is scheduled to be held in Annapolis, Md.

[*Beverly Brannan* and *Anita Nolen*]

APPENDIX II

Vol. 33, No. 25 June 21, 1974

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PLAN OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

Preface

The Library of Congress Affirmative Action Plan for fiscal year 1975 is part of a comprehensive long-range effort to promote equal employment opportunity through the achievement of the following goals:

A. To research, analyze, and improve, where warranted, all personnel policies, practices, and procedures to insure that they promote equal employment opportunity for all employees and applicants in practice as well as in principle;

B. To develop organizational climates which promote efficiency and effectiveness and in which each staff member is encouraged and assisted to achieve and contribute at his or her maximum potential; and

C. To promote the inclusion of minorities and women in all categories and grade levels of Library employment in the proportions which reasonably would be expected on the basis of the availability of qualified minority group members.*

This Affirmative Action Plan establishes five Priority Objectives for accomplishment during fiscal year 1975 and continues commitments made in prior Affirmative Action Plans until completed. Progress achieved toward the Priority Objectives and in Continuing Programs will be reported in the Semi-Annual Progress Reports on Affirmative Action scheduled for publication in January 1975 (for the period July 1-December 31, 1974) and in July 1975 (for the period January 1-June 30, 1975).

Priority Objective 1
EXPAND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TRAINING, APPRAISAL, AND PROMOTION PROGRAM (TAP)

The Affirmative Action Training and Performance Appraisal Agreements program initiated during fiscal year 1974 will be continued on an expanded basis. Selection procedures will be made uniform throughout the Library (i.e. Application, Rating and Evaluation Forms, Training Agreement formats, and basic eligibility criteria will all be standardized to the extent practical). All TAP positions will be announced on graphically distinctive posting forms through the normal posting system. Special efforts will be made to insure that all potential applicants (who can be identified) have notice of the advancement opportunities.

The responsibility for managing the TAP program within departments is assigned to department directors. They will be assisted by departmental TAP Committees which will consider all applications for TAP positions, and recommend selections to department directors. The Committees will be comprised of two permanent and two ad hoc members, as follows:

1. A Chairman—designated by the department director
2. The TAP Program Coordinator—representing the Assistant Director of Personnel for Equality Programs
3. A staff representative of the Placement and Classification Office
4. The TAP Position Supervisor—either the Chief of the Division where the TAP position is located or the Supervisor of the position.

The Chairman and the TAP Coordinator will serve as permanent members. The representative of the Placement and Classification Office and the TAP Position Supervisor will serve as ad hoc members during the selection processes. The Chairman, with assistance as required from the TAP Coordinator, will exercise general program oversight within the Department to insure that program objectives are met.

---

*From U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Statement on Affirmative Action for Equal Employment Opportunities.* Publication No. 41, February 1973, p. 7.

Competition for TAP Agreements during fiscal year 1975 will again be intra-departmental. At their discretion, however, department directors may waive this provision and open the competition to all potential applicants within the Library.

The Library is committed to establishing a minimum of 50 TAP Agreements during fiscal year 1975. This includes seven new positions to be established by the Congressional Research Service under its Crossover and para-professional programs which will operate on a slightly modified time schedule. The breakdown of positions by department is as follows:

Administrative Department	5
Copyright Office	10
Processing Department	18
Reference Department	10
Congressional Research Service	7
TOTAL	50

The above figures are to be considered minima; departments are encouraged to exceed those numbers wherever possible. The positions will be filled in two phases during fiscal year 1975, half in the first phase and the remainder in the second. Phase I selections will be made on or about October 15, 1974 and Phase II selections will be made around March 15, 1975.

Action Items	Responsibility	Schedule
A. Appoint TAP Committee	Department Directors Director of Personnel	July 15, 1974
B. Develop and publish FY 1975 Program Announcement (eligibility criteria, application and selection procedures, etc.)	TAP Program Coordinator Training Office Placement and Classification Office	August 1, 1974
C. Announce and post Phase I TAP vacancies	Departments TAP Coordinator Placement and Classification Office	September 1, 1974
D. Make Phase I TAP selections	Department TAP Committees	October 25, 1974
E. Develop Training Agreement for each Phase I TAP selectee	TAP Coordinator Training Office Tap Position Supervisor	November 29, 1974
F. Announce and post Phase II TAP vacancies	Departments TAP Coordinator Placement and Classification Office	February 15, 1975
G. Make Phase II TAP selections	Department TAP Committees	March 30, 1975
H. Develop Training Agreements for each Phase II TAP selectee	TAP Coordinator Training Office TAP Position Supervisor	May 1, 1975

Priority Objective 2
RESEARCH THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, COMMUNICATE THE RESULTS OF THIS RESEARCH, DEVELOP A WOMEN'S ACTION PLAN, AND SPONSOR A SPEAKERS PROGRAM

The Library will organize a Federal Women's Committee to assist the Federal Women's Program Coordinator in communicating about the program, collecting research data on the status of women in the Library, and sponsoring a speakers program. In addition to regular dissemination of research results, the Federal Women's Program Coordinator will develop a women's action plan to assure equal opportunity for women employees and applicants.

Action Items	Responsibility	Schedule
A. Establish and activate a Federal Women's Committee to assist the Federal Women's Program Coordinator.	Librarian Federal Women's Program Coordinator	July 1, 1974
B. Conduct research on the status of women at the Library of Congress with the goal of developing a specific action plan.	Federal Women's Program Coordinator	July 1, 1974 and continuous
C. Publish or otherwise disseminate research findings.	Federal Women's Program Coordinator	Continuous beginning September 1974
D. Sponsor and conduct a speakers program.	Federal Women's Program Coordinator	Continuous beginning September 1974
E. Continue and further develop training for supervisors on the Federal Women's Program at the Library.	Federal Women's Program Coordinator	July 1, 1974 and continuous

Priority Objective 3
EVALUATE LIBRARY QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS FOR JOB RELATEDNESS

This Objective is continued from the 1974 Affirmative Action Plan, which included a study of Employment Tests. An outside consultant will be utilized to assist the Library in this effort.

Action Items	Responsibility	Schedule
A. Supervise Consultant study	Assistant Director of Personnel for Equality Programs (ADEP)	July 1, 1974 thru April 15, 1975
B. Draft recommended Library of Congress Policy	ADEP Placement and Classification Office	June 1, 1975

Priority Objective 4
DEVELOP A PROGRAM TO CONSIDER THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF SPANISH SURNAMED APPLICANTS AND EMPLOYEES

The Library will initiate a program to increase the awareness of Spanish surnamed applicants and employees of Equal Employment Opportunity in the Library. The program will also solicit their ideas and suggestions for identifying the special needs and problems of the Spanish surnamed. In particular, the Spanish community of the Washington Metropolitan area will be informed of opportunities at the Library of Congress and advised on appropriate application processes.

Action Items	Responsibility	Schedule
A. Review recruitment practices and procedures and recommend improvements, if needed, to assure Spanish surnamed applicants equal employment opportunity.	Spanish Coordinator Placement and Classification Office	December 15, 1974 and continuous
B. Contact local and national Spanish-American organizations to inform them of the opportunities at the Library of Congress.	Spanish Coordinator Placement and Classification Office	October 15, 1974 and continuous

Priority Objective 5
RESEARCH AND ANALYZE EMPLOYEE MOBILITY PATTERNS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Library will review the employment histories of a significant number of employees within various job classification series and at various educational levels, etc. to determine typical upward mobility patterns within the Library. These findings are expected to be useful in employee career-counseling and in developing more realistic career development planning.

Action Items	Responsibility	Schedule
A. Complete research	ADEP	April 15, 1975
B. Publish research findings	ADEP	June 1, 1975

CONTINUING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

In addition to the five Priority Objectives, the Library will continue the following, previously established Affirmative Action programs (responsible offices are shown in parentheses):

A. **Tuition Support**: The Tuition Support program will be continued as in fiscal year 1974; however, employees who are studying for Bachelor's degrees or are enrolled in non-degree programs will be given preference this time over employees studying for Master's degrees. This means that applications for funding of Master's degree programs will not be considered until applications for lower degrees have been reviewed. An annual report on Tuition Support will also be issued. (Training Office)

B. **TAP Training for Supervisors**: A course specifically covering all aspects of the Affirmative Action program (with particular emphasis on the roles and responsibilities of supervisors) will be developed and given to all supervisors who supervise employees with TAP Agreements. (Training Office)

C. **Employment Tests**: The Library will continue research on the adequacy of employment tests. Either replacement or correction will be recommended for current tests found to be non-objective, as warranted. (ADEP)

D. **Communication about Affirmative Action**: The Library will continue to inform Library staff and the public about the Affirmative Action program through established news media (particular the LC *Information Bulletin* and the *Affirmative ACTION News),* multi-media presentations (tape-slides etc.), and meetings with employees. (ADEP)

E. **GUSTI (Greater Utilization of Skills and Training for Individuals)**: will supply the Library with trainees at the GS-1 level. These are chosen from applicants who have taken the LC Clerical Test, but have not passed it. In addition, many are not high school graduates. They are mainly trained for entry level clerical positions through a combination of formal classroom and on-the-job training. (Placement & Classification Office)

F. **Counseling and Advisory Service with Respect to Career Advancement**: The Library will continue to offer this service to the staff as an aid to both professional and non-professional employees in developing career goals based on knowledge of their aptitudes, abilities, and interests as revealed through testing and counseling sessions. (Training Office)

G. **General Equivalency Diploma**: The Library will continue to provide instruction which prepares employees for taking the high school equivalency examination for the GED Certificate. This instruction is available to all employees desiring to obtain a high school diploma. (Training Office)

H. **Beginning Typing/Shorthand and Refresher Typing Courses**: These courses are designed to help employees develop and refine basic skills needed to qualify for clerk-typist and secretarial job opportunities throughout the Library. (Training Office)

I. **Under-utilization of Skills Survey**: A survey of employees GS-7 and below will be made to identify individuals who feel that their knowledges, skills, and abilities are not being fully utilized in their current positions. Those wishing to register their qualifications through this survey may do so by submitting an Under-utilization Registration Card. The survey will be taken each year in July and registrations received as a result of the survey will be maintained in the active applicant supply file for a one-year period. (Placement & Classification Office)

APPENDIX III

Vol. 33, No. 25 June 21, 1974

NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL; A CHALLENGE

[Editor's Note: Lawrence G. Livingston, Program Officer of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., and Head of CLR's Systems Group, prepared the following paper on behalf of and in consultation with those persons attending the conference on National Bibliographic Control, jointly sponsored by CLR and the National Science Foundation, and held in Washington, D.C. on April 17-20.]

On April 17-20, the National Science Foundation and the Council on Library Resources jointly sponsored a two-day meeting with the theme "National Bibliographic Control." For the purposes of this meeting, National Bibliographic Control was considered to have three principal components: (1) the unique identification of items of recorded information in various media; (2) the mechanics necessary to provide intellectual access to each such item of information; and (3) standardization, which is necessary to make meaningful communication possible among those who provide information, those who process and store it, and finally those who use it.

Represented at the meeting were major libraries, publishing houses, abstracting and indexing services, standards activities, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Science Foundation, the Library of Congress, and the Council on Library Resources.

The overall objective of the meeting was to provide a solid, progressive framework of approved objectives to constitute a series of working programs for all concerned in the foreseeable future. These programs would be codified and widely circulated and would facilitate participation by producers, disseminators, and using agencies or individuals. This objective should lead to increased understanding and acceptance of the logical role each has to play.

BACKGROUND PROVIDED TO PARTICIPANTS

National Bibliographic Control requires a degree of compatibility among the systems of those who produce, store, disseminate, and use information which will permit the easy transfer of bibliographic records. This is equally true in machine and manual systems although the specific requirements for compatibility may be different in the different forms. In the ideal situation, each bibliographic item would be cataloged once and, where appropriate, indexed and/or abstracted once. A single record for each item should be generated as near the source of the item itself as possible and should be made available to all who require it. This ideal condition may not often be possible, but its principles are still valid for guiding long-term objectives.

There will always be great diversity among information-handling systems. They are created for different purposes, are developed on different schedules, are funded from various sources, and are responsible to local, State, and Federal agencies and to private and commercial institutions. The clientele served by these systems is almost infinitely varied; so are the products and services it requires. This being the case, complete uniformity in the systems devised to process information in the United States is out of the question. A reasonable approach to compatibility among such diverse systems is to concentrate on the mechanisms, formats, and standards for information exchange among them, leaving each system free to design its own internal formats, procedures, products, and services, and requiring only that each system provide in-and-out compatibility with the agreed-upon standard medium of exchange. Meanwhile, we should strive to eliminate needless duplication of effort and promote multiple use of common elements of information.

Systems compatibility for the exchange of information may be considered on four levels: (1) record format compatability, (2) record content designation, (3) record content consistency and completeness, and (4) character sets.

Record format compatibility is achieved when one system can "read" a bibliographic record created in another system. In a manual system this is easily achieved by agreement on a language and alphabet for exchange. In machine systems, such things as physical medium, mode of recording, blocking and parity factors, etc., must be considered. A good example is International Standards Organization ISO-2709, the basic MARC (MAchine-Readable Cataloging) format for international bibliographic exchange. Standard formats constitute an absolute requirement for efficient present-day bibliographic interchange.

Once standard formats are agreed upon, standard

designators must be devised for the data element content of the record. Since many of the data elements in question vary greatly in average length, tagging by positional notation—element identification by character count from a fixed point in the record—is not practical. This means that standard schemes must be devised to tag elements of the record, delimit them, and indicate their relationship to each other, to the overall record, and to the literature item represented by the record.

For efficient bibliographic exchange among disparate systems, firm agreements must be worked out as to the conventions under which records to be exchanged must be filled out. Every data element to be filled out must be closely examined; the most difficult aspects are achieving intellectual consistency in what is to be contained in data elements and reliability in what is actually entered. In the past, except for records emanating from the Library of Congress, bibliographic records created at one library seldom found their way into files of another library, so there was little reason to worry about dissimilarity in the way cataloging rules were interpreted, or even whether the same set of rules and procedures was followed from one institution to the next. Consideration of the exchange of records, especially in computer-supported systems, alters the situation radically. If records from one institution are going to be useful *without expensive alteration* in another place, then there is a compelling requirement for standardization in the data content itself. Some will argue that the flexibility and speed inherent in computers obviate the requirement for much standardization, but diversity of this kind costs money that we can no longer afford.

The requirements of most systems, manual or automated, can be satisfied with the representation of their information by the character set on a standard American typewriter—52 alphabetic characters, nine or 10 numeric, and up to 23 or 24 special characters (question marks, brackets, and so on) for a total of approximately 86 characters. Some systems get by with fewer characters by using only upper case letters and the numerals 0 to 9. Bibliographic systems, however, have a significantly larger character set requirement. The MARC character set, for example, includes 175 discrete characters, even though Cyrillic is not included. Even larger character sets are required in systems for abstracting and indexing scientific and technical literature. For libraries and other institutions using languages based on ideographs instead of alphabetic characters, the size of the character set increases even more. Relatively little has been done against the whole requirement in bibliographic systems for character set representation beyond the basic Roman alphabet set. Input-output devices are notoriously weak in this regard; very few line printers or low cost terminal devices come close to satisfying the basic requirement for bibliographic systems.

Standard formats, tagging schemes, and character sets permit systems to read each other's records, and to locate and identify the component parts of these records. But records and data elements thus read and identified cannot be used fully unless the *content* of each data element has the same intellectual value, no matter where it originates. Several things are involved here. For example, to achieve the desired consistency in data records created for bibliographic control in library work, a single set of cataloging rules must be consistently followed. The same applies to input and editing conventions. Extreme care must be exercised to see that data elements are complete and authoritative and that no keystroking errors are made. When data elements are coded to save space or for other reasons, the code used must have the same meaning for everyone if expensive cross-reference and look-up are to be avoided. When exchange is contemplated among libraries and agencies using different cataloging rules and input and editing conventions, not to mention people, the problems are vastly compounded.

National Bibliographic Control can be considered as a continuum of parallel lines, one line being drawn by the item of literature itself as it progresses from the mind of its author through the publication process, the dealer, and the library, and to the person for whom all of this was done—the user. The other line is followed by the surrogate for the item, its bibliographic record. The first line is straightforward; the book or other literature item is conceived, recorded, transcribed into more or less permanent form, acquired in an information store, and then finally reaches the user. It is the line or path followed by the surrogate and the surrogate itself which is of vital concern. Intellectually, the path followed by the bibliographic record is a continuum, and in practice is characterized by stops and starts and much duplication of effort with the data elements and even the complete record being changed or discarded several times in the process. Up to now, the path followed by most bibliographic records has been characterized by gross inefficiency when measured against the principle that every bibliographic record should be created once, as near the source of the literature item

as possible, to include abstracting and indexing as appropriate. Conversion to machine-readable form should occur only once, again as near the source as possible. The best example of what should be done is given by a Cataloging in Publication Record for books from the Library of Congress. The bibliographic record is created from the galley proofs, very near indeed to the source. The record is converted to machine-readable form once and is usually available in advance of the printed work. In this process, the parallel lines of book and surrogate are truly and permanently parallel.

There are many reasons why this almost perfect example seldom occurs, reasons of finance, personality, geographic distance, differing requirements, and differing customs and traditions.

With this background, presented here in abridged form, participants discussed the following topics during the conference:

National Data Base Building for National Bibliographic Control
Bibliographic Levels in Data Records
Authority Files
Subject Access
The Data Element Approach to Information Processing
Extension and Interfacing of Standard Formats
Effective National Guidance to the Development of Bibliographic Systems
Coordinated Development of Software—Exportability and Documentation
Achievement of Common Content Designators (Tagging Schemes)
Data Representation and Standards
Obstacles to Multiple Use of Original Identification Record of Publishers of Primary Material
Effective Access to Primary Literature Through Cooperation Among Access Services and Document Supply Organizations
Shared Input and Multiple Use
Principles for Acquiring Systems Librarians
Redefining the Functions of Library Catalogs.

In spite of the diversity of interests represented by the participants (see attached list) the discussions revealed a remarkable degree of willingness to arrive at points of consensus. Out of these discussions came the following conclusions and recommendations, each subscribed to by the majority of the participants.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We agree in principle that a requirement exists for a more coherent national bibliographic system. We further agree that a national bibliographic system will be built, but that we should not try to design it all now. We agree the programs for action which come out of this meeting should constitute some of the building blocks of the improved national bibliographic system.

We agree that an essential part of the national bibliographic system is a national system of coordinated bibliographic files. These files should be in machine-readable form and should contain records which will provide for the unique identification of each item and will list appropriate locations of each. Utility, priority, and economic considerations must determine what is to be included in this data base.

Concentration on the minimum record required for bibliographic identification will permit:

A. Agreement across professional and disciplinary boundaries which could not be reached on a complete, detailed record.

B. Decentralized input.

C. Exchange of the basic record, with a significant saving in original preparatory work and keyboarding.

D. Each national discipline or institution to augment these basic records to carry out its mission.

E. Each local agency or institution to augment these basic records to suit its own requirements.

We therefore recommend that working parties be set up to:

1. Define the minimum bibliographic record which will uniquely identify items of each type and form of information, following international and national standards where applicable.

2. Determine requirements for additional standards for bibliographic description and make recommendations to the appropriate agencies. In arriving at each recommended new standard, a comprehensive review of the various parallel efforts in different communities at national and international levels dealing with the same or closely related areas should be conducted in the early planning stages.

3. Explore the feasibility of interchange of bibliographic identification information to reduce duplicative creation of records among the Library of Congress Copyright Office, the Library of Congress cataloging processes, and activities of publishers. One possible goal is a common input data sheet to permit one-time generation and common use of this information. Under the principle that the basic

national bibliographic record for item identification should be created once and as near the source as possible, we conclude that there is a potential for coordinated action among these parties to the mutual benefit of all, and in the national interest. We therefore recommend that representatives of these agencies begin as soon as possible to examine the possibilities for cooperation in the creation, use, and dissemination of a basic bibliographic record for identification. We urge that specific attention be given to existing national and international standards, to include standard codes for identification.

4. Mount an effort among concerned principals (Library of Congress MARC Development Office, MARBI Committee of the American Library Association, Association of Scientific Information Dissemination Centers, National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services, and Information Industry Association) to establish the content designators for bibliographic interchange to accommodate serials articles, patent documents, technical reports, dissertations, and other materials covered by abstracting and indexing services which are not now described in existing Library of Congress Machine-Readable Cataloging formats (e.g., monographs and serials titles are already covered in existing standards). This implies the coordination of the content designators for these forms of materials with the content designators of existing formats in an effort to arrive at a standard set across the publishing, abstracting, and indexing and library communities.

5. Mount a study effort to determine the requirement and techniques for coupling non-character representation (for example, records containing the graphic representation of chemical structures) to records for bibliographic identification, in harmony with bibliographic format standards.

6. Improve the effective access to the primary literature through the cooperation of abstracting and indexing services, libraries, and other parties in building improved document location services. Resources and capabilities are available from a variety of sources, and projects have been proposed for implementation of improved means. The orientation of this work should be to make maximum use of on-line technology. The participants strongly recommend that at least the sources of files and project activity identified at the meeting be enjoined to collaborate to produce better tools for locating specific items of primary literature in the U.S.

7. Define and assess the feasibility and utility of a comprehensive national name-access file for the bibliographic data base, including various forms of personal and corporate names of importance to bibliographic control and the applicable cross-references. The design must permit on-line access to the file for major users and must allow specified agencies to flag authoritative forms of the names as appropriate.

8. Mount a joint effort on the design and implementation of a central broad subject access file which serves as a directory to fully detailed subject-authority files where coverage of specific disciplines may be found. This approach is based on the firm conclusion that a monolithic, complete, centralized subject authority file is not feasible at this time.

In addition, a capability for searching very large files by means of on-line and other modes of access, to assist in performing many of the functions now carried out using card catalogs in many U.S. libraries, is viewed as a necessary and feasible development. The meeting acknowledges and encourages the intensive review of large card catalogs being initiated by the Association of Research Libraries Committee on the Future of the Catalog.

The assembled group recognized the need for proper training of personnel for the broad spectrum of bibliographic systems and services that is not being fully met by the existing library school and computer and information science programs. The meeting discussed possibilities, including special curriculum development and various forms of internships, that could be considered to strengthen the knowledge and skills of personnel for development and operation of bibliographic systems and services. Although several participants cited shortages of appropriately trained persons, no consensus was reached on an action recommendation in the area of training.

The participants join in supporting an effort (by or through the sponsors of this April meeting) to identify or create an on-going body or mechanism that could establish or improve the channels of communication between interested groups or agencies and that could promote or otherwise take appropriate actions to advance social objectives and national needs in the fundamental aspects of bibliographic control, including (but not limited to) such activities as developing national strategies, identifying areas for standardization, protecting system integrity, providing national direction for international participation, and assigning responsibility to accomplish specific tasks.

Planning Committee for the Conference

Mrs. Pauline Atherton
School of Library Science
Syracuse University

Mr. Jay L. Cunningham
Director
University-wide Library Automation Program
Institute of Library Research
University of California at Berkeley

Mr. Lawrence G. Livingston
Program Officer
Council on Library Resources

Dr. Jerrold Orne
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina

Dr. Ronald L. Wigington
Director of Research and Development
Chemical Abstracts Service
Ohio State University

Participants

Mrs. Pauline Atherton
School of Library Science
Syracuse University

Mrs. Henriette Avram
Chief, MARC Development Office
Library of Congress

Dr. Harold Bamford, Jr.
Program Director
Office of Science Information Services
National Science Foundation

Mr. E. H. Brenner
Manager, Abstracting and Indexing Service
American Petroleum Institute

Dr. Lee Burchinal
Head, Office of Science Information Services
National Science Foundation

Dr. Frederick Burkhardt
Chairman
National Commission on Libraries and
Information Science

Dr. Fred C. Cole
President
Council on Library Resources

Mr. Jay L. Cunningham
University of California at Berkeley

Miss Ann Ekstrom
Ohio College Library Center

Dr. Herman H. Fussler
The University of Chicago

Mr. Warren J. Haas
Vice President for Information Services and
University Libraries
Columbia University

Mr. James W. Henderson
Andrew W. Mellon Director of the Research Libraries
The New York Public Library

Dr. Ralph H. Hopp
Director of Libraries
University of Minnesota

Dean Edward G. Holley
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina

Miss Stella Keenan
Executive Director
National Federation of Abstracting
and Indexing Services

Mr. Frederick Kilgour
Director
Ohio College Library Center

Mr. Dan Lacy
McGraw-Hill Book Company

Mr. Paul Lagueux
Information Systems Specialist
Council on Library Resources

Dr. Joseph Leiter
Associate Director, Library Operations
National Library of Medicine

Mr. Lawrence G. Livingston
Program Officer
Council on Library Resources

Mr. John G. Lorenz
Deputy Librarian of Congress

Mr. W. Kenneth Lowry
Director, Library and Information Systems
Bell Telephone Laboratories

Mr. Norman Mangouni
Director
State University of New York Press

Mr. Foster E. Mohrhardt
Senior Program Officer
Council on Library Resources

Mrs. Marlene D. Morrisey
Executive Assistant to the Librarian
Library of Congress

Dr. Carol A. Nemeyer
Association of American Publishers

Dr. Jerrold Orne
School of Library Science
University of North Carolina

Miss Margaret K. Park
Manager, Information Sciences
Office of Computer Activities
University of Georgia

Mrs. Sarah N. Rhodes
Office of Science Information Services
National Science Foundation

Miss Barbara Ringer
Register of Copyrights
Library of Congress

Mr. C. Sumner Spalding
Assistant Director for Cataloging
Processing Department
Library of Congress

Mr. Peter F. Urbach
Deputy Director
National Technical Information Service
U.S. Department of Commerce

Mr. A. Uszak
R. R. Bowker Company

Mr. Carlos Velasco
Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnologia
Mexico

Mr. Samuel T. Waters
Deputy Director, Resource Development
National Agricultural Library

Mr. William J. Welsh
Director, Processing Department
Library of Congress

Mr. Harry S. White, Jr.
Associate Director for ADP Standards
Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology
National Bureau of Standards

Mr. Herbert S. White
Executive Vice-President
Stechert-Macmillan, Inc.

Dr. Ronald L. Wigington
Director of Research and Development
Chemical Abstracts Service
Ohio State University

Mr. James L. Wood
Chemical Abstracts Service
Ohio State University